

Shaykh 'Alee Ibn Yahyaa al-Hadaadee

Extremism in Takfeer



SALAFIMANHAJ.COM
EEMAAN AND KUFR SERIES:
VOLUME 5

الغلو في التكفير

**EXTREMISM IN TAKFEER
IS BEING IN THE
UNITED NATIONS KUFR?
(AND OTHER RELATED ISSUES)¹**

By Shaykh 'Alee Ibn Yahyaa al-Hadaadee

*With additional points of benefit from
Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez bin Rayyis ar-Rayyis*

Translated by 'AbdulHaq ibn Kofi ibn Kwesi al-Ashanti

¹ From Shaykh 'Alee al-Hadaadee, *al-Ghuloo wa Madhaahirahu fee Hayaat il-Mu'aasirah* (Cairo: Daar ul-Manhaaj, 1426 AH/2005 CE), pp. 42-55. The book also has introductions from Shaykh Waseeullaah bin Muhammad 'Abbaas and Shaykh Ahmad bin Yahyaa an-Najmee (*hafidhahumullaah*).

© Copyright **SalafiManhaj** 2006

URL: **www.SalafiManhaj.com**

E-mail: admin@salafimanhaj.com

Important Note:

The following document is an on-line book publishing of www.SalafiManhaj.com. This book was formatted and designed specifically for being placed on the Web and for its easy and convenient distribution. At the time of this e-book publishing, we are not aware of any other book similar to it, in terms of its translation from its original Arabic source. Since this book was prepared for free on-line distribution we grant permission for it to be printed, disbursed, photocopied, reproduced and/or distributed by electronic means for the purpose of spreading its content and not for the purpose of gaining a profit, unless a specific request is sent to the publishers and permission is granted.

TAKFEER ON ACCOUNT OF DOING THAT WHICH IS PERMISSIBLE

From its aspects is: what is manifested by some organisations which have attracted many of the Muslim youth during this era to make *takfeer* of every Muslim country which is part of the *United Nations (UN)*.² At times they make the cause of *takfeer* to be allegiance to the

² So for example, *Hizb ut-Tahreer* regurgitate that being a part of the UN is *kufir*. In an article by Naveed Butt (the 'official spokesman for HT' in Pakistan) dated August 4 2006 CE he states:

"The extraordinary gathering of traitors on the 3rd of August in Kuala Lumpur has brought nothing but a new evil, a new mischief and a new surrender. This gathering marked yet another despicable proof of the treachery of the Muslim rulers. Instead of announcing that they would send armies to protect the Muslims of Lebanon, these imperialist agents, called for the strengthening of the *Taghoot* (kufr entity), the UN..."

The *juhaal* of the so-called website '*Islamic Thinkers Society*' (!?) in their simplistic article '*The Apostasy of the Rulers*' state:

"All the rulers are agreeing to sit with all the kuffar and Mushrikeen from all over the world in the U.N. this is KUFR AKBAR and makes them Kafir."

So they have hereby issued a *fatwa* even though the so-called '*Islamic Thinkers Society*' of *takfeerees* are not those who are those fit to make such serious rulings in the *deen* based upon their own desires and therefore it is more beneficial for the likes of them to keep their mouths shut and learn the basics of the *deen*. Indeed, within their '*Press Release to the Media*' the speaker cannot even recite *Khutbah ul-Haajah* correctly and at one point even states that "we fight against Allaah"!! (refer to the link below, the speaker says this exactly eighteen minutes into the talk!) Not to mention the lack of referring to what Allaah says and what the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) says and a whole array of other errors and *jahl* within their so-called '*press release to the media*.' See: <http://video.google.co.uk/videoplay?docid=-3982856370526939649&q=ITS+Press+Release+to+the+Media>

These are the so-called '*Islamic Thinkers Society*', they should seriously *think* about learning Arabic first and then *think* about how to read *Khutbah ul-Haajah* correctly before even *thinking* that they can pass judgments of *takfeer* upon the Muslim rulers without '*ilm* or precedence from the scholars! Similarly, in their '*Press Release to the Muslim Communities of North American*' after nearly forty minutes of personal gripes and making *takfeer* of the Muslim rulers (thus making their blood, property, honour and wealth *halaal*) they only mention one *hadeeth* from the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*)! And these are the people who claim they want to return to the rule of the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*)?!

On the website '*Islamic Awakening*' they have an '*FAQ on the Taliban*' (!?) wherein under point 11 they make the error of thinking that being a part of the UN necessitates some sort of 'assistance' from them, which is not even what the UN is mainly set up for in the first place! As we shall see within this treatise *inshaa'Allaah*. They thus condemn being part of the UN based upon their own reasoning with no reference to the scholars and no detailed analysis. A similar pattern is given by 'Abu Dujanah' (*majhool*) in an article entitled '*Why Have the Governments Disbelieved?*' Wherein another simplistic assessment is put forth as if

kuuffaar and we shall discuss this in the section related to allegiance and enmity and at other times they make the cause of their *takfeer* to be ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, and this will also be clarified when he come to discuss the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. Most of the time, they do not apply *takfeer* based on these affiliations merely due to the causes and we will also discuss this later in this field of research.

I say: This *takfeer* is invalid and extreme because it is *takfeer* on account of doing something which is permissible. It is decisively known that the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) made treaties with the *mushrikeen*, *yabood* and their allies, which indicates that it is permissible as long as it does not agree on doing things which are evil. Member states have freedom to reject (any view, idea, resolution or article) which they do not see fit, not to mention that (view, idea or article) which is *kufr* which expels one from Islaam.

From that which indicates its permissibility is the fact that its canon is mainly organisational structured around worldly benefits and not legislative, this is the case with the regulations organised around affairs of travel, trade, administration and its like. Therefore, the main intent of this organisation (i.e. the UN) is to bring about peaceful solutions between its members and serve as an organisation which fosters peaceful relations politically, economically, culturally etc.

Based upon this, its covenants come under the affairs of social interactions and the foundation of social interactions is: permissible except for that which is mentioned in the

the unknown 'Aboo Dujaanah' is qualified to now write on such serious matters and deliver judgements of *takfeer*! In a lecture entitled '*Let the Scholars Beware!*' 'Abdullaah Faysal al-Jamaykee al-Khaarijee stated:

"Even if they implemented the Sharee'ah still they'd be kaafirs because they give their allegiance, their bay'ah, their oath of allegiance, to the UN..."

In a vile lecture entitled '*The Devil's Deception of the 21st Century House Niggers*' Faysal states:

"So these tyrannical leaders which we have in our midsts today who have given their allegiance to the UN or the USA or the UK or all the other Dajjaal forces on the face of the earth they are kaafirs and I will explain it later why they are kaafirs. So the soldiers of these leaders are also kaafirs..."

In the same lecture Faysal states:

"Now which ayah in the Qur'aan tells you that the moment you give your bay'ah to NATO or the UN you're a kaafir?"

For a concise refutation of the statements of Faysal see:
http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_Deception.pdf

Usaamah Bin Laadin, in his ignorance, also made *takfeer* of Saudi Arabia due to it being a member of the UN. [Translator's Note]

Divine Legislation as being forbidden.³ So it is from the common practices and is not from the acts of worship and common practices, as stated by Ibn Taymiyyah:

Are what the people have become used to doing in their worldly affairs which they need. The foundation here is to avoid that which is forbidden, so it is not to be forbidden unless it is something which Allaah has forbidden.⁴

Therefore, concluding treaties within these organisations are not prohibited from this angle however what is prohibited is to agree on matters which Allaah has already forbidden, based upon the saying of the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*): *‘What is the condition of men who make conditions based on conditions which are not based on the Book of Allaah? Every condition which is not based on the Book of Allaah is invalid even if there are a hundred conditions. The book of Allaah is truer and the stipulation of Allaah is firmer.’*⁵

So if an Islamic state was obligated to agree with some resolutions which opposed the Divine Legislation and was not befitting for them to agree with, then to make *takfeer* cannot be justified except with specific conditions, which will be explained later *inshaa’Allaah* in the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed.

What is prohibited for a Muslim: is to have allegiance to the *kuffaar*, but not interaction with them via buying, selling, leasing, peace and rectification, good neighbourliness and the likes which are mentioned in the texts as being permissible. The Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) used to interact with the *kuffaar* and conclude treaties with them regarding buying, leasing, cultivation, rectification, peace and social pacts, just as the Khaza’ah tribe allied themselves to the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) and they were still upon *shirk*⁶ at that time. He (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) also made a peace treaty with the *yahood* when he emigrated to Madeenah and concluded an agreement with them based upon good neighbourliness and to support them against anyone who transgressed against them, and they were still upon the *kufr* and their *shirk*.⁷ He (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) made rectification

³ *Majmoo’ al-Fataawaa*, pp.28-386

⁴ *Ibid.* vol.29, pp.16-17

⁵ Sunan Ibn Maajah, vol.2, pp.842-843, no.2521

Translator’s Note: There is a similar *ahadeeth* in *Saheeh Bukhaaree* in the ‘Chapter on the Mukhaatab – Manumission of Slaves’ and ‘Conditions’ related from ‘Amra and the *hadeeth* of ‘Urwah from Aa’ishah (*radi Allaahu ‘anhaa*).

⁶ See the *Seerah of Ibn Hishaam* (vol.2, p.318)

⁷ *Ibid.* vol.1, pp.501-504

with the Quraysh in Hudaibiyah which was a rectification which in its conditions was detrimental to the Muslims and unfair to them.⁸ Yet this was all because he (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) hoped to prevent the evils which were greater and more severe and bring about benefits which were greater than armed *jihad* against the Quraysh at that time, this is not denied except by an ignoramus or a misguided person.

In addition to the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) concluding treaties of peace and alliance between himself and the *mushrikeen*, he (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) also instructed to fulfil pre-Islamic alliances which were founded upon justice and helping the oppressed. The

⁸ The *Hudaibiyah Treaty* was made between the Muslims and the polytheists of Quraysh. When the *mushrikeen* of Quraysh witnessed the determination of the Muslims to risk their lives, properties, wealth and families for their faith in order to spread it peacefully, they realised that the Prophet Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) and his followers (*radi Allaahu ‘anhum*) could not be bullied or frightened by mere scare tactics. Therefore, a treaty of reconciliation and peace was made between the Quraysh and the Muslims. The clauses of the treaty were:

- The Muslims would return and come back in the following year (7 AH) but they would not stay in Makkah for more than three days and without arms except those concealed.
- War activities were to be suspended for ten years, during which both sides will live in security with neither side waging war against the other.
- Whoever wishes to join Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) was free to do so and likewise whoever wished to join the *mushrikeen* of the Quraysh was also free to do so.
- If anyone from the Quraysh joins Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) without his parent's or guardian's permission, he should be sent back to the Quraysh, but should any of Muhammad's followers return to the Quraysh, he was not to be sent back. (Safiur-Rahman al-Mubarakpuri, *The Sealed Nectar (ar-Raheequl-Makhtum)* Darusalam, 2002, p.403)

The treaty was significant in that the Quraysh began to recognise the Muslims legitimate existence and began to deal with them on equal terms. Safiur-Rahmaan al-Mubaraakfooree (al-Mubarakpuri) notes in his biography of the Prophet Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) pp.407-408: "The Muslims did not have in mind to seize people's property or kill them through bloody wars, nor did they ever think of using any compulsive approaches in their efforts to propagate Islam, on the contrary their sole target was to provide an atmosphere of freedom in ideology or religion, **"Then whosoever wills, let him believe, and whosoever wills, let him disbelieve."** {*al-Kahf* (18): 29}" The Muslims on the other hand had the opportunity to spread Islaam over areas not then explored. When there was the peace agreement, war was abolished, and men met and consulted each other, none talked about Islaam intelligently without entering it; within two years following the conclusion of the treaty, twice as many people entered Islaam than ever before. This is supported by the fact that the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) went out to al-Hudaibiyah with only 1400 men, but when he set out to liberate Makkah, two years later, he had 10,000 men with him. [TN]

order to fulfil such alliances is an evidence of the permissibility of such alliances on the condition of what has been mentioned prior. From 'Abdullaah ibn 'Amru bin al-Aas (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) that the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said in his *khutbah*: “Fulfil the alliance (*hilf*) of the pre-Islamic period, for it does not increase it...” Meaning: Islaam “...except strengthen and there is no alliance in Islaam.” Related by at-Tirmidhee who said: **“it is Hasan Saheeh.”**⁹ Muslim reported in the *Saheeh* from Jubayr bin Mut'im in a *marfoo'* form¹⁰: “There is no alliance in Islaam yet Islaam strengthens (the *hilf*) established in the pre-Islamic days (for good).”¹¹ So he forbade the alliance in Islaam and instructed to fulfil the alliance of *jaabiliyyah*.¹² The intent of his saying: “There is no alliance in Islaam” means: the alliance which includes that which is forbidden, 'Aasim al-Ahwal asked Anas bin Maalik “Has it reached you that the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said “There is no alliance in Islaam”?” Anas replied: “The Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) made an alliance between the Quraysh and the Ansaar in my house.” Reported by al-Bukhaaree.¹³ At-Tabaree said:

What Anas indicated was the verification of an alliance, which does not negate the hadeeth of Jubayr ibn Mut'im as the aforementioned fraternity was during the first hijrah and they were transmitting it and then that heritage was abrogated. Yet there remained that which the Qur'aan did not invalidate such as co-operation upon truth and help and taking the oppressor by the hand¹⁴ as stated by Ibn 'Abbaas¹⁵: “This alliance was formed for help, mutual advice and support and a legacy can be made for him and (the right to) inheritance was excluded.”¹⁶

⁹ Sunan at-Tirmidhee, vol.3, p.241, hadeeth no.1585

¹⁰ A *marfoo'* hadeeth is a hadeeth which has been reported by a companion and due to what is within the hadeeth is elevated to a saying of the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*). [TN]

¹¹ Saheeh Muslim, vol.4, p.1961, hadeeth no.2530

¹² This alliance (*Hilf ul-Fudool*) is sometimes translated as an ‘order of chivalry’ (a rather odd translation) or as ‘a league of nobility’, ‘an alliance of excellence’, ‘an alliance of the virtuous’, ‘a committee of wisemen’, ‘an alliance for charity’, ‘a treaty for mutual assistance and goodness’, ‘a pact of the virtuous’ most of these different translations capture the essence of the *hilf ul-fudool* which was to help the poor, needy and oppressed and assure justice and human rights. [TN]

¹³ Saheeh ul-Bukhaaree, vol.2, p.803, hadeeth no.2172

¹⁴ I.e. to prevent the oppressor from oppression. [TN]

¹⁵ This hadeeth is reported in the Sunan Aboo Daawood (*Kitaab ul-Faraa'id – Shares of Inheritance*)

¹⁶ Fath ul-Baaree, vol.4, p.473, his saying “(the right to) inheritance is excluded” means that: inheritance is only via the three well-known means which are: marriage, lineage and allegiance only, inheritance is not obtained via religious brotherhood or fraternity.

This statement of Ibn 'Abbaas was also reported by at-Tabaree in his *tafseer* of Allaah's statement,

ä ä

“...and to those whom your oaths have bound (to you) – give them their share.¹⁷”

{*an-Nisaa* (4): 33}

He stated:

Others stated: These verses were revealed in regards to the people who make treaties by alliances, however some of them were instructed to give each other their share of support, mutual advice and the likes except for inheritance. Those who said that: Aboo Kurayb narrated to us, saying: Aboo Usaamah narrated to us, saying: Idrees al-Awadee narrated to us, saying: Talhah bin Musrif narrated to us, saying: from Sa'eed ibn Jubayr: from Ibn 'Abbaas:

ä ä

“...and to those whom your oaths have bound (to you) – give them their share.¹⁸”

{*an-Nisaa* (4): 33}

...from help, mutual advice and support and a legacy can be made for him and inheritance is excluded.”

Then he stated:

“From Mujaahid,

ä

“...and to those whom your oaths have bound (to you)...”

{*an-Nisaa* (4): 33}

...who said: “There were alliances in jaahiliyyah and in Islaam they were commanded to give them their due share of understanding, support, consultation, but not of inheritance.”¹⁹

¹⁷ By bequest, as only those relatives mentioned in verses 11 and 12 inherit fixed shares.

¹⁸ By bequest, as only those relatives mentioned in verses 11 and 12 inherit fixed shares.

Al-'Allaamah al-Mubaarakfooree (al-Mubarakpuri) in his explanation of the *hadeeth*:

"Fulfil the alliance (bilf) of the pre-Islamic period, for it does not increase it...." Meaning: Islaam
"...except strengthen and there is no alliance in Islaam":

"His saying *"fulfil..."* is from fulfilling what is established in accordance with the pact *"...the alliance (bilf) of the pre-Islamic period"* meaning: the pacts which are in the alliance which do not oppose the Divine Legislation in accordance with Allaah's saying,

ä ä

"...fulfil all contracts (promises, covenants and oaths)."

{*al-Maa'idah* (5): 1}

But (such an alliance) has to be based on what Allaah said,

ä ää

"And co-operate in righteousness and piety, but do not cooperate in sin and transgression."

{*al-Maa'idah* (5): 2}

"For it..." meaning: Islaam, *"does not increase it..."* meaning: the alliance of *jaabiliyyah* which does not oppose Islaam *"...except strengthen..."* meaning: firm strengthening that necessitates you to fulfil it."²⁰

From the extant texts regarding fulfilling the pacts and agreements of *jaabiliyyah* and its covenants is: the *hadeeth* of Aboo Hurayrah who said "The Messenger of Allaah said *"I had not seen an alliance except for the alliance of the Quraysh from the alliance of the Muteebeen and it was more beloved to me than the red camel (i.e. precious to me)."*²¹ Also there is the *hadeeth* of Talhah bin 'Abdullaah bin 'Awf, which is *mursal*,²² that the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu alayhi*

¹⁹ *Tafseer Tabaree*, vol.8, p.278

²⁰ *Tuhfat ul-Ahwaadhee*, vol.5, p.209

²¹ *Sunan ul-Bayhaquee al-Kubraa*, vol.6, p.366

²² If in the chain of a particular *hadeeth*, the link between the successor (*tabi'ee*) and the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) is missing, the *hadeeth* is *mursal* (hurried), e.g. when a *tabi'ee* says "The Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said..." A *mursal hadeeth* is the strongest type of weak *hadeeth* and

wassallam) said: *“I had witnessed a meeting of an alliance in the house of ‘Abdullaah bin Jud’an which was more beloved to me than the red-camel and if I had been called to join it in Islaam I would join.”*²³ He (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) stated on the day of Hdaybiyah before he made the peace treaty with the Quraysh: *“By Allaah, the Quraysh will not ask me today for any matter in regards to ties of kinship except that I would give them it.”*²⁴ In *Sabeeh Muslim* from Hudhayfah bin al-Yamaan (radi Allaahu ‘anhu) who stated: *“The only thing that prevented me from being at Badr was that I was out with my father Husayl when the kuffaar of the Quraysh got us and said “you want Muhammad?” we said “we do not want him, we just want to get to Madeenah.” They took from us the promise of Allaah and His covenant that we would go to Madeenah and not fight with him. The Messenger of Allaah came to us and informed us saying “Go! For you have made a promise with them and we seek Allaah’s help against them”.*²⁵

These texts are explicit regarding the obligation to fulfil alliances of *jaahiliyyah* based upon justice because Islaam exhorts and supports that. So what can be taken from this is the permissibility of participating in an alliance with them wherein there is a benefit for the Muslims.

The UN is an international organisation which intends, according to what is apparent from its announced articles in its charter, agreement of its members to take the oppressor by the hand, avert confrontations, spread peace throughout the world and solve disputes via peaceful means. These are principles which are totally acknowledged and supported in Islaam. It is mentioned in the UN Charter, article one as follows:

The Purposes of the United Nations are:

1. **To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law,**

requires supporting narrations to strengthen it to the level of *“hasan due to supporting evidence”*, thereby removing doubt. [TN]

²³ *Sunan ul-Bayhaquee al-Kubraa*, vol.6, p.367

²⁴ *Musnad al-Imaam Ahmad bin Hanbal*, vol.4, p.323, hadeeth no.1893

²⁵ *Saheeh Muslim*, vol.3, p.1414, hadeeth no.1787

Translator’s Note: And in another narration: *“Grant them your promise to them.”*

adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace.
3. To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

In article 2 it is mentioned:

1. All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.
2. All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.²⁶

So a Muslim makes a pact with *kuuffaar* based upon abandoning unwarranted enmity and upon settling disputes via peaceful means and the like (of such means) which are not forbidden let alone being *kufr* if done. It is not to be denied that there are resolutions and some articles of the UN which are included in its purposes which are not permissible within the Divine Legislation. However, we see that the Saudi state, may Allaah grant it success, which is harmed by a greater share of *takfeer*, did not fall into those resolutions and did not acknowledge them and this is a great position from the ones in charge of its affairs, we ask Allaah to increase them from His virtue, His success and His help.²⁷ This organization, with all that is within it from evil, being a part of it has led to bringing about benefits and averting harms, which is a huge thing in itself yet it is not possible to explain this fully in this abridged treatise. Therefore, with such international organizations, political, economic educational relations have been formed, besides others, and with them the lands of the Muslims have been protected from great evils.

²⁶ *Al-Qanoon ad-Dawlee*, pp.998-999

²⁷ See the book *Mawqif ul-Mamlakat il'Arabiyyah as-Saudiyyah min al-Qadaayah al-Aalamiyyah fee Hay'at il-Umam al-Muhtadah*, which mentions a load of issues which Saudiyyah rejected being signatories to, the reason of rejection being based on such issues opposing the Divine Legislation of Islaam.

The Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) accepted the conditions of the Quraysh in Hudaibiyah despite what was within it of unfairness and deficiency for the Muslims. However, the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) hoped to avert greater evils than those conditions and hoped for benefits which were greater than their entry into the Sacred House (i.e. Makkah) in that year and thus he (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) concluded the treaty. In relation to this *al-'Allaamah* Rasheed Ridaa stated in *Tafseer ul-Manaar* in discussing Allaah saying,

Ô ä ä

“...except when taking precaution against them in prudence.²⁸”

{*Aali-Imraan* (3): 28}

So if allying with them is permissible in order to avoid harm, then it is permissible wherein the benefit for the Muslims is primary. So based on this, it is permissible for the Muslim rulers to ally themselves with the non-Muslim states out of an interest to the believers by averting harm and bringing about benefit.²⁹

During his time, Rasheed Ridaa censured a people who made *takfeer* of their leader due to him meeting the British and coming to a position of mutual agreement and trust with them, he said:

Those who speak in the name of the deen without knowledge and commentate on the Qur’aan based on their desires claim that the verses of Aali-Imraan and whatever is in its meanings regarding the general and specific prohibition such as the saying of Allaah,

â ä Ô ä â ä Ô

“O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies.”

{*al-Maa'idah* (5): 51}

...indicates that it is not permissible for Muslims to be make pacts (or alliances) or to agree with other than them, even if the alliance was for their own benefit! (The people

²⁸ When fearing harm from an enemy.

²⁹ *Tafseer al-Manaar*, vol.3, p.280

who hold that position) have bypassed the fact the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) was allied to the Khaza'ah tribe while they were still upon their shirk. Some those enthusiastic for the deen based on ignorance even claim that it is not permissible to have any interaction or association whatsoever with non-Muslims or agreements with them on any issue. It has already become known to us as we write on this matter that one of the newspapers that we saw via telegram mentioned that some fanatical Afghaanees angry with their leader who interacted with the English (i.e. British) in India, came to a position of mutual agreement and trust with them and wore Western attire. The Afghaanees all came to a collective agreement and ruled their leader to be a kaafir who must be removed from power. An army was sent to split up their ranks and the likes of such ignorant fanatics and enthusiasts are the worst of creation to Islaam and the Muslims, rather they are the most distant from the reality of Islaam than the rest of the worlds!³⁰

With this report from the Shaykh (*rahimahullaah*) it becomes apparent that the entry of a Muslim country into the UN, or any other organisation like it, is no problem due to what it is based upon in terms of major benefits, on the condition that it does not concur on that which contains disobedience to Allaah and His Messenger (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*).

Before we conclude this area of research: I bring attention to the fact that none of the Imaams of the contemporary *Salafees* have made *takfeer* of a Muslim country due to it being part of these organizations according to what my research has indicated. So if it (i.e. being a member of the UN) was from the actions which necessitate *kufir* they would have made this clear without delay, even once. So their silence on the matter indicates that they do not view any harm in it and this is what is thought by them. From here it is also known that those who make *takfeer* due to this reason are from the extremists and transgressors of the era, and with Allaah is success.

³⁰ *Tafseer al-Manaar*, vol.3, pp.277-278

TAKFEER BASED ON SOMETHING POSSIBLY BEING KUFR, WHEN IT IS ACTUALLY DISOBEDIENCE

From the manifestations of repulsive extremism is: specific *takfeer* due to something which could possibly have many aspects of interpretation: such as making *takfeer* of a Muslim whose Islaam is verified with the certainty of all people and then he wears a medal at a ceremony of honour, so even though it is a medal it could possibly be seen as being a cross and it could possibly be something else.³¹ So such a person should not be rashly made *takfeer* of and this condition is one of pouring scorn on the sanctity of the Muslims and having contempt of the Divine Legislation of the Lord of the worlds, as it is an issue wherein one could possibly be ignorant of the ruling of wearing a cross and could possibly be due to a lack of knowledge that the medal is a cross in origin and any one of these possibilities prevent *takfeer* being made. Why not? When it has been said that the person in question was informed about the situation and he immediately removed it and sought forgiveness from Allaah, yet still those who are crazy with *takfeer* spread that the person is a *kaafir* even up to this day, and Allaah's refuge is sought. Concluding with a point of benefit: the *Permanent Committee for Islamic Verdicts (Lajnah ad-Daa'imah)* was asked:

“We differ in regards to a Muslim who wears a cross, the symbol of the Christians, some of us judge with the kufr of the individual and some of us say “We do not judge him with kufr until we debate him and make clear to him the prohibition of that as it is a symbol of the Christians and if he continues upon displaying it then we judge him with kufr.””

Answer:

“Detailed explanation within this matter and its likes is necessary. If it is made clear to him the ruling of wearing the cross and that it is the symbol of the Christians and that wearing it indicates that one is pleased to be associated with them and pleased with what they are upon, and then continues upon that (i.e. wearing it) then he is judged with kufr based on Allaah's saying,

³¹ As the image of a cross is the placing of a (horizontal) line and its likes over a slightly longer (vertical) line so that the small (horizontal) line is high up about a third of the way down of the long (vertical) line from the top formed by crossing the right angles. *Fatwa Lajnah ad-Daa'imah*, vol.2, p.121

ä ä ä ä ä

“And whoever is an ally to them among you – then indeed, he is one of them. Indeed,

Allaah does not guide the wrongdoing people.”

{*al-Maa'idah* (5): 51}

...when wrongdoing is applied here the intent is major shirk.³²

TAKFEER ON ACCOUNT OF WHAT COULD POSSIBLY BE KUFR, DISOBEDIENCE OR PERMISSIBLE

From the manifestations of this extremism is: what has occurred of *takfeer* due to what they claim is helping the *kuffaar* against the Muslims in the American war against Afghanistan and al-'Iraaq. It is obligatory to know that there is no doubt that assisting the *kuffaar* in such instances is a despicable crime and a great evil, however *takfeer* cannot be made of a specific individual until it is explained:

So if one helps them, at the same time possessing hatred of Islaam, love of *kufr* and a desire to manifest *kufr* and exalt it, then there is no doubt of the *kufr* at such a time. Yet if the one doing it (i.e. aiding the *kuffaar*) does it out of a worldly concern while absolutely believing in the prohibition of his action, then such an individual is upon great danger, however he is not made *takfeer* of due to his action. If his action was out of being compelled and a necessity then Allaah has said,

ä Õ ä ä ä ä ä

“...except one who was forced while his heart is assured with *eemaan*.”

{*an-Nabl* (16): 106}

So if Allaah has excused the believer who expresses *kufr* while his heart is still assured with *eemaan* in a state of compulsion, then what about other than that which deserves more of an excuse?

³² *Fataawaa Lajnah ad-Daa'imah li'l-Iftaa'*, vol.2, p.119, *fatwa* no.2245

An evidence of this explanation is: the story of Haatib Ibn Abee Balta'ah (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) from 'Alee Ibn Abee Taalib (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) who said: "The Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) sent myself, Zubayr and al-Miqdaad ibn Aswad saying: "Proceed until you reach Rawdatu Kbaakb³³ therein you will find a woman with a letter so take the letter from her." So we set out and our horses ran at full pace until we got to ar-Rawdah wherein we found the lady and said to her "Take out the letter." She replied, "I have no letter with me." We said, "Either you give us the letter or we will take your clothes off." So she took it out of her braids and we took the letter to the messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*), and within the letter was a message from Haatib ibn Abee Balta'ah to some people from the *Mushrikeen* in Makkah informing them of some of the intentions of the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*). The Messenger of Allaah said to Haatib "O Haatib what's this?" Haatib replied "Do not be hasty against me. I was an ally of Quraysh, but I was not one of the important ones; those who immigrated with you have relatives there to protect their families and friends, but since I do not have such links, I wanted to do them a favor so that they would protect my family. I did not do it out of *kufr* or due to apostasy from the deen or out of being pleased with *kufr* after Islaam." The Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said "Indeed, you have spoken the truth." Umar said: "O Messenger of Allaah, allow me to strike the neck (i.e. execute) this *munaafiq*!" The Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said: "Verily he (i.e. Haatib) was at Badr and what do you know, Allaah might have looked at them (warriors of Badr) and said (to them), "Do what you like, for I have forgiven you." Agreed upon.³⁴

Within this *hadeeth* it is apparent that the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) did not make *takfeer* of him at the first opportunity due to assisting the *kuffaar* against the Muslims. This indicates that his action was not *kufr* in similar situations, rather it will be *kufr* if the motive was being pleased with *kufr*. If it could not possibly be anything except *kufr*, the

³³ Situated between Makkah and al-Madeenah

³⁴ *Saheeh Bukhaaree*, vol.3, p.1095, *hadeeth* no. 2845 and *Saheeh Muslim*, vol.4, p.1931, *hadeeth* no. 2494. What is also unfortunate is that harmful speech has emerged regarding the rights of this companion from some who attach themselves to *da'wah* and Islamic knowledge. From them are those who say that "**Haatib fell into the greatest treachery**" and from them are those who say that he disbelieved due to his action, and all of this is major evil. The Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) did not refer to Haatib's action as being "**kufr**" or "**the greatest treachery**" rather he referred to it as a sin which Allaah will expiate due to Haatib's righteous actions such as his being present at the battle of Badr. Then the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) absolved Haatib and accepted his repentance and instructed that he not be mentioned except with good, so where are the keepers of his promise (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*).

GENERAL TAKFEER – “ABSOLUTE TAKFEER DUE TO RULING BY OTHER THAN WHAT ALLAAH HAS REVEALED”

What has become widespread today is what has come to be known as “*Tawbeed ul-Haakimiyyah*” which means according to those who adhere to it: the *kuff* of all those who do not rule by the Divine Legislation of Islaam in matters of the limitations and personal affairs. They also connect to this *takfeer*, without explanation, of the countries which rule by man-made laws, some of them go to further extremes and make *takfeer* of the people of those countries due to their following the leader, to the extent that some of them say:

“Humanity has apostated to the worship of slaves and to the joining of religions. Humanity has retreated from La ilaha il-Allaah and if a group of mankind are shaded from it they return to La ilaha il-Allaah without comprehending its significance and meaning and thus apostasizes from it, and without rejecting the Divine Legislation of Haakimiyyah which the servants call to for themselves, which is a synonym for Uloohiyyah, whether legislation is called to as individuals, as organisations or as a people. As individuals, like organizations and like a people, are not a deity and they do not have the rightful permission to Haakimiyyah (sovereign rulership) due to humanity having return to Jaahilyyah (the pre-Islamic period of ignorance) and having thus apostasized from La ilaha il-Allaah yet these slaves have been given the characteristics of Uloohiyyah and they did not single out Allaah alone and make allegiance sincerely for Him. All of humanity, including those who repeat from the minarets from east to west, the words ‘La ilaha il-Allaah’...³⁶

These frank words clearly show that the writer sees no problem in making *takfeer* of Islamic peoples today, even those who call the *adbaan* calling out the word of *tawbeed* to those who repeat them!³⁷ All due to the governments not ruling by the Divine Legislation and because

³⁶ *Fee Dhilaal il-Qur’aan*, vol.2, p.1057

³⁷ This entire sentence from Sayyid Qutb, which Shaykh ‘Alee al-Hadaadee did not complete is as follows:

“All of humanity, including those who repeat from the minarets from east to west, the words ‘La ilaha il-Allaah’ without any significance or reality, are the most sinful of people and will be the most severely punished on the Day of Judgement, because they have apostasized by turning to the worship of the servants (of Allaah) after the guidance had been made clear to them and after they were upon the deen of Allaah...”

the people are pleased with this rule as the writer suggests. There is no doubt that this is extremism which even the *khawarij* did not say! And the *khawarij* were the ones who introduced the innovation of *takfeer* on account of committing major sins.

Ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is from the most hideous and despicable crimes, Allaah has said:

ä ð ä

“Whoever does not rule by what Allaah has revealed, then they are the disbelievers.”

{*al-Maa'idah* (5): 44}

These verses could possibly apparently mean that the ruler by other than what Allaah has revealed is a disbeliever who has committed major *kufr*, however Ibn 'Abbaas (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) the ink of the *ummah* and the commentator of the Qur'aan explained the verse as being *kufr* less than *kufr*, meaning: if he legalized it he has thus disbelieved. If he did not legalize it then he has not disbelieved, he (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) stated after reciting the words of Allaah,

ä ð ä

“Whoever does not rule by what Allaah has revealed, then they are the disbelievers.”

{*al-Maa'idah* (5): 44}

Whoever rejects what Allaah has revealed has disbelieved and whoever acknowledges it yet does not rule by it is a transgressing sinner.³⁸

Ibn 'Abbaas (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) also said:

It is not the kufr that they go towards; it is not the kufr which expels one from the religion,

ä ð ä

“Whoever does not rule by what Allaah has revealed, then they are the disbelievers.”

{*al-Maa'idah* (5): 44}

[TN]

³⁸ *Tafseer at-Tabaree*, vol.10, p.357

Means: kufr less than kufr.

Verified by al-Haakim who said: **“This hadeeth is of a Saheeh chain of transmission”** and did not reject it, adh-Dhahabee agreed with him saying **“Saheeh.”**³⁹ At-Tirmidhee stated:

It has been related from Ibn 'Abbaas, Taawoos, 'Ataa and more than one from the people of knoweldge who have said: “kufr less than kufr and fisq less than fisq”.⁴⁰

Imaam Ibn Qayyim (*rahimabullaah*) supports this *tafseer*, he said:

...and what is correct is: that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is between two types of kufr, minor and major depending upon the condition of the ruler. For if the ruler believes in the obligation of ruling what Allaah has revealed, yet does not apply out of being disobedient whilst knowing that he can be legible for punishment, then in this event this is minor kufr. Yet if one believes that to rule by what Allaah has revealed is not obligatory and that he has a choice in the affair while knowing that it is the rule of Allaah, then this is major kufr. If one is ignorant of it and errs then such an individual is mistaken and the ruling of those who err is to be applied to him.⁴¹

Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez Bin Baaz (*rahimabullaah*) stated in explaining this issue:

Whoever rules by other than what Allaah has revealed is not free from four matters:

1. The one who says “I rule by this (i.e. man-made laws) because they are better than the Divine Legislation of Islaam (i.e. Sharee'ah)” then such a person is a disbeliever, who has committed major kufr.
2. The one who says “I rule by these man-made laws as they are like the Divine Legislation of Islaam, and ruling by it is permitted, just as ruling by the Divine legislation of Islaam is also permitted” such a person is a disbeliever who has committed major kufr.
3. The one who says “I rule by these laws, but the Divine Legislation of Islaam is better, but ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is permitted.” Such a person is a disbeliever who has committed major kufr.
4. The one who says “I rule by these man-made laws” yet believes that it is not permissible to rule by other than what Allaah has revealed and says “Ruling by the Divine Legislation of Islaam is better and it is not permissible to rule by other than it” yet is weak or does this out of what his rulers have originated before him, such a

³⁹ *Al-Mustadrak 'alaa's-Saheehayn*, vol.2, p.313

⁴⁰ At-Tirmidhee, *Sunan at-Tirmidhee*, vol.5, p.21

⁴¹ *Madaarij us-Saalikeen*, vol.1, p.365

person is a disbeliever who has committed minor kufr which does not expel him from the religion and the action is considered to be from the major sins.⁴²

Secondly: If the *kufr* of a leader is verified based on the judgement of the people of knowledge who are firmly grounded in knowledge, then it does not necessitate the *takfeer* of his subjects or of his aides. In the same way it does not necessitate that due to them being the leader's subjects that they are pleased with what he is doing and are in agreement with his crime (of not ruling by what Allaah has revealed). Even if they are silent (with regards to the crime of not ruling by what Allaah has revealed) it could possibly be silence in order to preserve their lives and honour, or possibly out of their ignorance of the ruling or there could be other possibilities. Whoever's Islaam is verified with certainty then his Islaam is not negated except with similar certainty.

POINTS OF BENEFIT FROM SHAYKH 'ABDUL'AZEEZ BIN RAYYIS AR-RAYYIS REGARDING THE UNITED NATIONS⁴³

Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez bin Rayyis ar-Rayyis (*hafidhabullaah*) has dealt with this in *al-Burhan al-Muneer fee Dhad Shubuhaat Ahl it-Takfeer wa't-Tafjeer* in a chapter dealing with the issue of *takfeer* due to being in the UN. Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez ar-Rayyis notes that:

(The UN) is an organisation comprising of rules, resolutions, agreements and charters which most of the world's states are affiliated to, including the state of Saudi, may Allaah protect it. It (i.e. the UN) developed after the Second World War and the main aim of its development was to bring together nations and views and to narrow the variances which can emerge between nation-states which if left to continue would lead to dangerous consequences for peace and security between two states alongside achieving peace. It also was also set-up to prevent the use of power as a solution to global problems.

⁴² *Qadeeyat ut-Takfeer Bayna Ahl us-Sunnah wa Furuq ad-Dalaal [The Issue of Takfeer Between the People of Sunnah and the Misguided Groups]*, pp.72-73.

⁴³ Abridged from Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez bin Rayyis ar-Rayyis, *al-Burhaan al-Muneer fee Dhad Shubuhaat Ahl it-Takfeer wa't-Tafjeer*, pp.30-34 (www.islamancient.net)

Then Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez (*hafidhabullaah*) mentioned King Faisal highlighting this about the UN⁴⁴ and then the Shaykh stated:

And as the majority of the member states are kuffaar there are aspects which do not agree with the Divine Legislation and for that reason Saudi rejected some of the system and did not agree with all that is in it. Here unto you are some of the agreements and treaties that the Saudi state, may Allaah protect it, did not accept:

1. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia did not agree with the agreement judging all forms of discrimination against women. Talaal Muhammad Nooh 'Ataa stated: "The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia preserved this agreement put did not adhere itself to what opposed the Divine Legislation of Islaam.
2. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia did not agree with article 16 which says that a man and a woman, when they reach the age of marriage, they have the right to marry without any religious conditions. Saudi Arabia stated in a memo sent to the United Nations "The marriage of a Muslim male to a polytheist woman or to a woman who does not believe in the existence of Allaah is a matter that Islaam has prohibited. Also, the marriage of a Muslim male to a woman of the book, being a Christian woman or a Jewish woman is a matter that Islaam has allowed. As for the marriage of a non-Muslim male to a Muslim female then this is impermissible.⁴⁵
3. The state of tawheed did not agree with article 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which gives anyone the right to change their religion. ⁴⁶
4. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia did not implement two state covenants, the first being particular to economic, social and cultural rights and the second being related to political and civic rights due to what is within these covenants of contents which do not conform with the Divine Legislation of Islaam.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ *Majallat Faysal*, no.106, Rabee' al-Aakhir 1406 AH

⁴⁵ *Mudhakirat ul-Hukoomah Saudiyyah ilaa Munnadhmat il-Ummamil-Muhtahidah Hawla Tatbeeq Huqooq ul-Insaan fi'l-Mamlakah 'Amalan bi'sh-Sharee'ah Islaamiyyah* [Memo of the Saudi Government to the United Nations Organisation About the Application of Human Rights in the Kingdom According to the Divine Legislation of Islaam], *Majallah 'Arabiyyah*, no.1, p.182. Also see *Kitaab Mawqif Mamlakat il'Arabiyyat is-Saudiyyah min al-Qadaayah al'Aalamiyyah fee Hay'at il-Ummamil-Muhtahidah* [The Position of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in Regards to World Affairs in the United Nations Organisation], p.98

⁴⁶ Ibid

⁴⁷ *Kitaab Mawqif Mamlakat il'Arabiyyat is-Saudiyyah min al-Qadaayah al'Aalamiyyah fee Hay'at il-Ummamil-Muhtahidah* [The Position of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in Regards to World Affairs in the United Nations Organisation], p.98

So if this was the situation of the Saudi state with the UN, in that it does not accept those aspects of the system which contradict the Divine Legislation of Islaam, by the admission of the leaders of this state (i.e. Saudi), may Allaah grant them success with His guidance of what is in it, and their application of the Divine Legislation practically and preserving the Divine Legislation in face of the system and contradictory resolutions. So if this is the condition of the Saudi state in its dealings with the UN, why then, O people of justice, is it abused and made takfeer of? Is it not from its right that it is thanked rather than made takfeer of due to its avoidance of resolutions which oppose the Divine Legislation of Islaam? Is it not from its right that it is supported and trusted due to its unique pride, amongst all of the Islamic countries, in the Divine Legislation of Islaam and preserving it against whatever contradicts it.

B. THE BENEFIT DEPENDS ON THE ENTRY OF THE SAUDI STATE TO THIS ORGANISATION

To protect itself from its kuffaar enemies, or even rather, some Islamic countries which oppose the creed of the Salaf lay in wait for the state of tawheed to meet with disaster for many well known reasons. From the clearest proofs of this is the first Gulf war wherein one state attacked another. What is repeated in the Divine Legislation is circumstances of weakness are different from a state of strength. The treaty of Hudaibiyah is the best witness and proof for this. The historian, Shaykh Ibraaheem Bin 'Ubayd Aal 'AbdulMuhsin in his historical book *Tadhkiratu Awlee wa'n-Nahy wa'l-'Irfaan bi-Ayaam Allaah al-Waahid ad-Dayaan*:

“Sixthly: Ibn Saud made agreements just as his fathers did in order to keep away the enemies from the regions of Kuwait, Bahrayn, the Shaykhs of Qatar,⁴⁸ the coastal areas of 'Uman (Oman) which were under the rule of the British and had treaty relations with the aforementioned government. Also, the agreements were to neither interfere in the affairs of these countries nor to settle in those areas, the treaty was signed on (circa) 18 Safar 1334 AH corresponding to 16 December 1915 CE. There is no doubt that this type of agreement is allowed...and the well-versed historian Fu'ad Hamza⁴⁹ stated about it that the treaty was permitted. The adept intelligent memoriser who was gifted with fame for free thinking, composure of intellect and independent opinion

⁴⁸ The Ottoman Turks were driven out of these three regions in 1913 CE after Ibn Sa'ud finally defeated them at al-Ahsa. [TN]

⁴⁹ He is the author of *Qalb Jazeerat ul-'Arab* (Riyadh: Maktabat an-Nasr al-Hadeethah, 1968 CE). [TN]

stated: “The short-sightedness of the advisor of Ibn Sa’ud of what was taking place in the world was clear and was merely taking advantage of the opportunities. However, it was said about the opportunity that the circumstances of the time necessitated a treaty to be signed...”⁵⁰

C. TO ASSUME, FOR ARGUMENT’S SAKE, THAT JOINING THE UN WAS RULING BY OTHER THAN WHAT ALLAAH HAS REVEALED

The Saudi state still would not be made takfeer of by being in it, because, as has been explained, ruling by what Allaah has revealed is due to weakness and the reign of the enemy, so it does not expel from the religion, this is what our Shaykh ‘Abdul’Azeez Bin Baaz and Shaykh al-Albaanee (rahimahumallaah) judged as has preceded.

ATTENTION: If joining the UN was ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed you would have seen our scholars such as Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibraaheem, Shaykh Sa’d bin ‘Ateeq, Shaykh ‘Abdul’Azeez bin Baaz and Shaykh Muhammad ibn Saalih al-’Uthaymeen (raheemahumullaah) reject it and clarify its prohibition. Rather, it is transmitted from some of them its permissibility (being part of the UN), Shaykh ‘Uthaymeen was asked:

“Some people say that joining the UN is rule by other than Allaah, is this correct?”

He answered:

“This is not correct, as each one in his country rules by what is required of him. So the people of Islaam rule by the Book (Qur’aan) and Sunnah and others rule by their laws. The UN does not force anyone to rule by other than what they rule by within their countries. Being in the UN is nothing other than from the aspect of treaties which take place between the Muslims and the kuffaar.”⁵¹

So rather, such scholars (which have just been mentioned above) constantly repeat that the Saudi state rules by what Allaah has revealed.

⁵⁰ Vol.2, p.198

⁵¹ *Majallat ud-Da’wah*, no.1608, dated: 10 Jumadaa al-Ulaa 1418 AH/September 11 1997 CE